

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the subject application. Claims 14-71 and 73-78 are pending, of which claims 14, 29, 42-45, 47, 50-65, and 67 have been amended to place the application in condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 79 depends from independent claim 14 and has been indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form (*Office Action* p.20). Applicant appreciates the indication of allowability.

Claim 14 is amended to include the allowable features of claim 79 (now canceled). Accordingly, independent claim 14 along with dependent claims 15-28 are in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 79 be withdrawn.

Similarly, independent claims 29, 42, 55, and 67 are also amended to include the allowable features of claim 79. Accordingly, independent claim 29 along with dependent claims 30-41, independent claim 42 along with dependent claims 43-54, independent claim 55 along with dependent claims 56-66, and independent claim 67 along with dependent claims 68-71 and 73-78 are all in condition for allowance.

Drawing Objection

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the Office contends that the "destination device" and the "server device" are not shown in the

1 drawings (*Office Action* p.2). Applicant respectfully disagrees, yet provides
2 amendments herein to advance prosecution and to place the application in
3 condition for allowance. The applicable claims, as amended, recite a "requesting
4 device" in place of a "destination device".

5 Claim 14, for example, recites "a server device configured to ... provide the
6 data to the requesting device". Fig. 2 of the subject application clearly illustrates
7 that a content server 210 (e.g., *a server device*) provides content 214 to a client
8 device 206 (e.g., *a requesting device* of the content 214). In support, the
9 specification states that "when a user of client device 206 requests new content, ...
10 content provider 202 provides the new content 214 from content server 210"
11 (*Specification* p.11, lines 5-8).

12 Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the drawings properly show a "server
13 device" in at least Fig. 2, and respectfully requests that the drawing objection be
14 withdrawn.

15 Claim Objections

16 The Office generally objects to the claims for not being consistent in the
17 naming of the elements throughout the specification, claims, and drawings (*Office*
18 *Action* p.3). Applicant believes that the claim amendments provided herein
19 address the general claim objections, and Applicant respectfully requests that the
20 claim objections be withdrawn.
21
22
23
24
25

35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections

A. Claims 1-23, 28-36, 41-50, 54-61, 65-75, and 80-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over a PCT International Publication Number WO 02/17205 A2 to DO, Arthur et al. (hereinafter, "Arthur"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,826,594 to Pettersen (hereinafter, "Pettersen") (*Office Action* p.3).

Claims 1-13, 72, and 80-81 are canceled. As described above, claims 14-23, 28-36, 41-50, 54-61, 65-71, and 73-75 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

B. Claims 24-27, 37-40, 51-53, 62-64, and 76-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Arthur in view of Pettersen, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0116494 to Kocol (hereinafter, "Kocol") (*Office Action* p.16).

As described above, claims 24-27, 37-40, 51-53, 62-64, and 76-78 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Conclusion

Pending claims 14-71 and 73-78 are in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully requests issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: Sep 1, 2005

By: 

David A. Morasch
Reg. No. 42,905
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
(509) 324-9256 x 210